19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Christopher P. Wesierski [Bar No. 086736] cwesierski@wzllp.com Michelle R. Prescott [Bar No. 262638]		
2			
3	mprescott@wzllp.com WESIERSKI & ZUREK LLP		
3	29 Orchard Road		
4	Lake Forest, California 92630 Telephone: (949) 975-1000		
5	Facsimile: (949) 756-0517		
6	Attorneys for Defendant, COUNTY OF		
	SAN BERNARDINO AND SAMUEL FULLER		
7			
8	UNITED STATES	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION		
10			
	GALE SOSTEK; and HERB SOSTEK,	Coso No. 5:22 ov 02226 MD A (MDWy)	
11		Case No. 5:23-cv-02236-MRA (MRWx)	
12	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE	
13	vs.	Trial Date: January 28, 2025	
14	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO;		
	and DOES 1-10, inclusive,		
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF		
18	,		
10	RECORD:		

Defendants the COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, and SAMUEL FULLER ("Defendants") hereby request that, pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 201, this court take judicial notice of the following federal court records, in support of their Motion to Stay Proceedings against Plaintiffs GALE SOSTEK and HERB SOSTEK ("Plaintiffs").

- 1. A screenshot of the California Department of Justice's website showing that the DOJ has an ongoing investigation involving Deputy Fuller and the lethal force encounter that is the subject of this civil action, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1
 - 2. The Parties' Joint Case Management Statement in this Action previously

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

filed as Docket Number 36 on March 18, 2024.

Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b) permits judicial notice of facts "not subject to reasonable dispute" in that they are either "(1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction or the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed.R.Evid. 201(b).

Specifically, a court may take judicial notice of the authenticity and existence of a particular order, motion or pleading. See U.S. v. Southern California Edison Co., 300 F.Supp.2d 964, 974 (E.D.Cal. 2004). A federal court may also take judicial notice of orders made in a state court proceeding. See Miles v. California, 320 F.3d 986, 987 n.1 (9th Cir. 2003).

Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully that the Court should consent to take judicial notice of the matters referenced above.

DATED: April 3, 2024

WESIERSKI & ZUREK LLP

nficher Russell

By:

MICHELLE R. PRESCOTT Attorneys for Defendant, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO